



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/730,817        | 12/08/2003  | Daniel Owen          | 1801270.00134US1    | 4224             |
| 23483             | 7590        | 09/08/2008           |                     |                  |
| WILMERHALE/BOSTON |             |                      |                     |                  |
| 60 STATE STREET   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| BOSTON, MA 02109  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER          |             |                      |                     |                  |
| KANG, INSUN       |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT          |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 2193              |             |                      |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 09/08/2008        |             | ELECTRONIC           |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com  
teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com  
sharon.mathews@wilmerhale.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/730,817

**Applicant(s)**

OWEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

INSUN KANG

**Art Unit**

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6-8, 14-18, 20, 23, 25-27, 33-38, 41, 43-45 and 51-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6-8, 14-18, 20, 23, 25-27, 33-38, 41, 43-45, 51-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 5/28/2008.
2. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 14-18, 20, 23, 25-27, 33-38, 41, 43-45, 51-55 are pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 14-18, 20, 23, 25-27, 33-38, 41, 43-45, 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava et al. (US 6,609,248) hereafter Srivastava, in view of Fujii et al. (US Pg. Pub. 2004/0015888) hereafter Fujii.

Per claim 1:

Srivastava discloses converting binary executable program code of a subject computing architecture into binary target code executed on a target computing system (i.e. col. 3 lines 19-28). Srivastava does not explicitly teach that conversion is performed dynamically. However, Fujii teaches such a dynamic binary translation was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to dynamically translate a program at runtime ("dynamic binary translation,"0010). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Srivastava's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Fujii. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary

Art Unit: 2193

skill in the art would be motivated to perform the binary translation from the intermediate representation disclosed in Srivastava only when the code is actually discovered at runtime.

Srivastava further discloses:

- wherein conversion of the program code is interleaved with execution of the target code on the target computing system (i.e. col. 14 lines 52-55; the EXE' 203 in Fig. 2A is a target specific executable for a target system, col. 8 lines 22-30)

- decoding a plurality of instructions in the program code (i.e. "After the instructions in the code blocks have been translated,," col. 7 lines 20-21)

- determining which type of nodes to generate in an intermediate representation for each of the decoded instructions in the program code (i.e. "Once the code and data blocks are identified, an IR creation process 212 evaluates each platform-dependent instruction on a block-by-block basis,," col. 6 lines 65-67),

- including determining that one or more of the decoded instructions require base nodes having basic RISC-like functionality which provides an expanded representation of semantics of the decoded instructions (i.e. "For RISC ...architectures,...instructions can be easily translated into a single platform-neutral IR instruction," col. 7 lines 3-6),

- and one or more of the decoded instructions require complex nodes having complex CISC-like functionality which provides a compact representation of semantics of the decoded instructions (i.e. "On the other hand, CICS...contain complex instructions that provide the function of multiple instructions," col. 7 lines 5-8);

- generating the intermediate representation of the decoded instructions using the determined types of nodes, including generating the base nodes and the complex nodes in

Art Unit: 2193

the intermediate representation from the respective decoded instructions (i.e. “the platform-dependent instructions that have a single platform-neutral IR instruction counterpart are translated into that platform-neutral instruction, while complex instructions are replicated as-is within the IR through an extended version of the basic IR instruction,” col. 7 lines 9-20);

-generating the target code from the intermediate representation and executing the target code on the target computing system (i.e. “Blocks of instructions that were originally written for one architecture can be translated from the intermediate representation into platform-specific instructions for a different architecture,” col. 14 lines 52-55; the EXE' 203 in Fig. 2A is a target specific executable for a target system, col. 8 lines 22-30).

Per claim 4:

Srivastava further discloses:

- wherein the base nodes are generic across a plurality of possible subject computing architectures (i.e. “a single platform-neutral IR instruction,” col. 7 lines 1-3).

Per claim 6:

Srivastava and Fujii do not explicitly teach that the determining step includes that the program code includes immediate type instructions in which a constant operand value is encoded into the instruction itself in an immediate field and in response determining that the immediate type instructions require the complex nodes. However, a CISC-like

Art Unit: 2193

functionality includes such immediate type instructions. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Srivastava and Fujii's disclosed system to include specific CISC functionalities such as immediate type instructions in the determining step so that such CISC-like instructions can be "replicated as-is within the IR through an extended version of the basic IR instruction (col. 7 lines 5-20)."

Per claim 7:

Srivastava further discloses:

- wherein each of the complex nodes may be decomposed into a plurality of the base nodes to represent the same semantics of an instruction in the decoded program code (i.e. "*CISC* (Complex Instruction Set Computer) ...contain complex instructions (col. 7 lines 5-10) which are composed with basic blocks that can be decomposed back into basic blocks).

Per claim 8:

Srivastava further discloses:

- generating the complex nodes only for those features which are correspondingly configurable on the subject computing architecture (i.e. "A replicated complex instruction is marked with a signature that denotes its architecture," col. 7 lines 13-16).

Per claim 14:

Srivastava further discloses:

Art Unit: 2193

- determining that one or more of the decoded instructions require architecture specific nodes (i.e. "set of platform-specific instructions to perform the same function as the original, complex instruction," col.8 lines 63-65).

Per claim 15:

Srivastava further discloses: generating the intermediate representation to include the architecture specific nodes which are specific to a particular combination of the subject computing architecture and the target architecture (i.e. col. 8 lines 55-65).

Per claim 16:

Srivastava further discloses: initially representing all of the instructions in the program code as subject architecture specific nodes, where each subject architecture specific node corresponds to a respective instruction in the program code (i.e. col. 6 lines 55-65); determining whether an instruction in the program code is one in which to provide a target architecture specialized conversion function; (i.e. col. 6 lines 65-67);

converting the subject architecture specific nodes into target architecture specific nodes for those instructions determined to provide a target architecture specialized conversion function (i.e. col. 8 lines 56-65);

generating the base nodes from the remaining subject architecture specific nodes which are not identified as providing a-the target architecture specialized code generation function (i.e. col.7 lines 1-5).

Per claim 17:

Art Unit: 2193

Srivastava further discloses: generating the target code from the target architecture specific nodes, wherein the target code is specialized for the target architecture (i.e. col. 8 lines 55-65).

Per claim 18:

Srivastava further discloses: generating the target code from the base nodes, wherein the target code is not specialized for the target architecture (i.e. col. 7 lines 1-5).

Per claims 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, and 33-37, they are the medium versions of claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 14-18, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 14-18 above.

Per claims 38, 41, 43-45, and 51-55, they are the apparatus versions of claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 14-18, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 14-18 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. The applicant states that: it is not possible for the ordinary skilled person to combine the static translation of heterogeneous programs as in Srivastava with a processor system for dynamic binary translation as in Fujii. It is not a simple or straightforward modification to combine the static user-oriented translation of a heterogeneous program as in Srivastava with a dynamic binary translation system as in Fujii (remark, 13).

In response, selecting either static or dynamic translation method whichever is more efficient is typically performed in the pertinent art. For the code that is not statically translated, the dynamic translation is usually applied as the code value is known at runtime as in Fujii. In addition, the instant specification states that “translation can be performed statically or dynamically (i.e. page 6, 0026).” Furthermore, the claims do not recite which parts of the translation are dynamic. Therefore, the combination of Srivastava and Fujii is not impossible. For the interleaving conversion order, the order logic could be full conversion of program and execution, and subsequent conversion of program and execution. Therefore, Applicant’s argument that a new system and method for dynamic binary translation which is not disclosed in any of the prior art documents is not persuasive. If applicant means anything more, this must be brought out in the claims to further clarify the invention.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2193

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to INSUN KANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Insun Kang/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193